Northern District of California

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN JOSE DIVISION

UNITED SPECIALTY INSURANCE COMPANY,

Plaintiff,

v.

BANI AUTO GROUP, INC.; SIA BANI & COMPANY, LLC; BANI INVESTMENTS, LLC; CLUB SPORTIVA, INC. f/k/a DRIVE A DREAM, INC.; and SIAVOSH BANIHASHEMI a/k/a SIA BANI.

Defendants.

Case No. 18-cv-01649-BLF

ORDER GRANTING PLAINTIFF'S REQUEST FOR DISMISSAL OF CERTAIN CLAIMS AND ENTRY OF **JUDGMENT ON CLAIMS 4 AND 7**

[Re: ECF 79, 87]

On September 14, 2021, the Court granted partial summary judgment for Plaintiff United Specialty Insurance Company and against Bani Auto Group, Inc., Club Sportiva, Inc., and Siavosh Banihashemi a/k/a Sia Bani ("Sia Bani") on Claims 4 and 7 of the complaint. See MSJ Order, ECF 78. Plaintiff thereafter filed a request for dismissal of all remaining claims, and entry of judgment on Claims 4 and 7. See Pl.'s Req., ECF 79. Defendants filed an objection to Plaintiff's request, asserting that Plaintiff erroneously sought prejudgment interest at a rate of 10% when the correct prejudgment interest rate is 7%. See Defs.' Obj., ECF 83. Defendants did not object to any other aspect of Plaintiff's request for dismissal of certain claims and entry of judgment. See id.

The Court entered two stipulated orders deferring ruling on Plaintiff's request, as the parties were attempting resolve the remaining issues in the case. See Orders, ECF 84, 86. However, on November 29, 2021, Plaintiff renewed its request for dismissal of certain claims and entry of judgment, indicating that the parties were unable to reach resolution. See Pl.'s Renewed

Case 5:18-cv-01649-BLF Document 88 Filed 11/30/21 Page 2 of 2

Court	alifornia
United States District Court	Northern District of California
\supset	No

_
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21

Req., ECF 87. Plaintiff now concedes that the appropriate prejudgment interest rate is 7%. See id
The Court agrees that in this diversity action, California law applies and entitles Plaintiff to
prejudgment interest at a rate of 7%, running from the date of Plaintiff's payment of \$1,000,000
on August 30, 2019. "State law governs prejudgment interest in a diversity action." Westport Inst
Corp. v. California Cas. Mgmt. Co., 916 F.3d 769, 781 (9th Cir. 2019). "The California
Constitution generally affixes the rate of prejudgment interest at seven percent per annum for
judgments rendered in state courts unless specified otherwise by the legislature." Id.; see also
MGA Ent., Inc. v. Hartford Ins. Grp., 869 F. Supp. 2d 1117, 1136 (C.D. Cal. 2012) (insurer's
claim for equitable contribution was subject to prejudgment interest at a rate of 7%).

Because Plaintiff has conceded the only issue as to which Defendants objected – the applicable prejudgment interest rate – the Court GRANTS Plaintiff's request for dismissal of certain claims and entry of judgment on Claims 4 and 7. A separate dismissal order and a judgment will issue concurrently with this order.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: November 30, 2021

BETH LABSON FREEMAN United States District Judge